



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/562,578

12/27/2005

Yasuharu Onishi

Q92252

7872

23373 7590 05/29/2008
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

ROSENAU, DEREK JOHN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/562,578	Applicant(s) ONISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Derek J. Rosenau	Art Unit 2834	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 May 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 4c, 22c, 1e, and 35. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (US 6359370) in view of Bullock (US 4140936).

4. With respect to claim 1, Chang discloses a piezo-electric actuator (Fig 1) comprising: a piezo-electric element (item 106) having a piezo-electric body which is

Art Unit: 2834

provided with at least two opposing surfaces (Fig 1), wherein the surfaces perform an expanding and contracting motion in accordance with a state of an electric field (column 3, lines 30-51); a constraint member (center of cruciform base 104) for constraining the piezo-electric element on at least one of the two sides, a supporting member (item 102) disposed around the constraint member, and a plurality of beam members (item 104) each having both ends that are fixed to the constraint member and the supporting member, respectively (Fig 1), wherein each beam member has a neutral axis for bending in a direction substantially parallel with the constrained surface (Fig 12 and column 6, lines 4-26), wherein the constraint member vibrates by vibration which is generated by constraining effect between the constraint member and the piezo-electric element, and is amplified by the beam members (inherent to the structure), wherein said beam members are straight beams (Figures 1 and 2).

Chang does not disclose expressly that the supporting member does not extend below the constraint member.

Bullock teaches a piezoelectric actuator (Fig 1), in which the supporting member (item 4) does not extend below the constraint member (item 3).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the supporting member arrangement with the piezoelectric actuator of Chang for the benefit of reducing the amount of material required by eliminating the bottom portion of the supporting member.

5. With respect to claim 3, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Chang discloses that said constraint

Art Unit: 2834

member has a base (center of cruciform base 104) for constraining said piezo-electric element, and a plurality of arms (item 104) that extend from said base to constitute said beam members (Fig 1).

6. With respect to claim 4, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Bullock discloses that said constraint member is a second piezoelectric element which differs in vibration direction from a first piezoelectric body (Fig 1).

7. With respect to claim 6, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Chang discloses that said piezoelectric element is provided with an insulating layer (item 104) on at least one of said two surfaces.

8. With respect to claim 7, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Chang discloses that said piezo-electric element has a rectangular parallelepiped shape (Fig 1).

9. With respect to claim 8, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Chang discloses a vibrating film (item 104) coupled to said piezo-electric actuator (Fig 1) for radiating sound through vibration that is transmitted from said piezo-electric actuator. The movement of the piezo-electric element would generate "sound" in that it would generate pressure waves in the air surrounding it.

10. With respect to claims 10 and 11, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezo-electric actuator according to claims 1 and 8 respectively; therefore,

Chang as modified by Bullock discloses an electronic device comprising these actuators, as piezo-electric actuators are electronic devices.

11. With respect to claim 14, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Bullock discloses that the constraint member (item 3) and the plurality of beam members (item 7 and 8) are made of metal or resin (column 2, lines 33-36).

12. With respect to claim 15, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Both Chang et al. and Bullock disclose that the constraint member and the plurality of beam members are integrated (Fig 1 of Chang and Fig 1 of Bullock).

13. With respect to claim 16, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1. Chang discloses that at least two beam members extend radially from the center of the constraint member (Fig 1).

14. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bullock and Sasaki et al. (US 7067965).

15. With respect to claim 5, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the piezoelectric actuator according to claim 1.

Neither Chang nor Bullock discloses expressly that said piezo-electric element comprises a plurality of said piezo-electric bodies and a plurality of electrode layers for applying an electric field to said piezo-electric bodies, wherein each piezo-electric body and each electrode layer is alternately laminated.

Sasaki et al. teaches a piezo-electric actuator in which the piezo-electric element comprises a plurality of said piezo-electric bodies and a plurality of electrode layers for applying an electric field to said piezo-electric bodies, wherein each piezo-electric body and each electrode layer is alternately laminated (Fig 3).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the stacked piezo-electric element of Sasaki et al. with the piezo-electric actuators of Chang as modified by Bullock for the benefit of allowing for larger displacements (column 1, lines 37-42).

16. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bullock and Toki (US 5856956).

Neither Chang nor Bullock discloses expressly a vibration transmitting member sandwiched between said piezo-electric actuator and said vibrating film.

Toki teaches a piezo-electric speaker device that includes a vibration transmitting member (item 46) sandwiched between a piezo-electric actuator (item 47) and a vibrating film (item 42).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the vibration transmitting member of Toki with the piezo-electric actuators of Chang as modified by Bullock for the benefit of crating a device in which the diaphragm itself need not be distorted (column 5, lines 53-58 of Toki).

17. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bullock and Ogura et al. (US 6453050).

18. With respect to claim 12, the combination of Chang and Bullock discloses the acoustic element according to claim 8.

Neither Chang nor Bullock discloses expressly a plurality of acoustic resonators which have resonance frequencies different from each other for smoothing frequency response of sound pressure.

Ogura et al. discloses an acoustic apparatus comprising a plurality of acoustic elements (figures 4 and 5) which have resonance frequencies different from each other for smoothing frequency response of sound pressure (column 11, lines 62-64).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the plurality of acoustic elements of Ogura et al. with the acoustic element of Chang as modified by Bullock for the benefit of providing additional output sources and reducing the peak dip of the output (column 11, lines 62-64 of Ogura et al.).

19. With respect to claim 13, the combination of Chang, Bullock, and Ogura et al. discloses the acoustic apparatus accord to claim 12. As the acoustic apparatus is itself an electronic device, the combination of Chang, Bullock, and Ogura et al. disclose an electronic device including the acoustic apparatus according to claim 8.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 9 May 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that it would not be obvious to combine Chang and Bullock as the device of Change states that it is support laterally and along its underside. However, Bullock does disclose that its beam members (items 7 and 8) are

supported along their undersides by the support member (items 4 and 6), and the support member does not extend under the constraint member (item 3). Applicant argues the differences between the functionalities of Chang and of the claimed invention. However, these functions are not currently claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Derek J. Rosenau whose telephone number is (571)272-8932. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on 571-272-2044. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Derek J Rosenau

Application/Control Number: 10/562,578
Art Unit: 2834

Page 9

Examiner
Art Unit 2834

/D. J. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 2834

/Darren Schuberg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2834